



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/634,185

08/09/2000

James S. Hiscock

3118-US

5742

56436 7590 06/14/2007
3COM CORPORATION
350 CAMPUS DRIVE
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752-3064

EXAMINER

TIEU, BINH KIEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/634,185	HISCOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BINH K. TIEU	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 13, 14, 16-21, 33, 34 and 63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 13-14, 16-21, 33-34, 63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/27/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 63, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Volansky et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,807,139).

Regarding claim 1, Volansky et al. ("Volansky") teaches a data outlet (i.e., surface mount multimedia outlet as shown in figures 1-6), suitable for connecting user-equipment located in a

user-operating area with a premises' data infrastructure (col.1, lines 14-21), the data outlet comprising:

user interface circuitry providing a plurality of user-data interfaces to said user equipment (i.e., Bezel or ports 32 in figures 1-2, 4 and 15-16);

premise interface circuitry providing a premise-data interface to said data infrastructure (i.e., note figures 9, 32-35), and

a bridge circuitry providing data packet transfer between said user interface circuitry and said premise interface circuitry (i.e.); and

a compact housing that (a) is configured of rigid material and has a rear and a front; (b) encloses said user interface circuitry, said premise interface circuitry, and said bridge circuitry, and (c) is mountable in or on a wall adjacent said user-operating area such that said front provides said a plurality of user-data interfaces and said rear provides said premise-data interface (also note figures 1-6).

Regarding claim 7, note figure 1.

Regarding claim 13, lines 25-36.

4. Claims 63, 7, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mayball et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,807,139).

Regarding claim 1, Mayball et al. ("Mayball") teaches a data outlet (i.e., data outlet as shown in figure 6), suitable for connecting user-equipment located in a user-operating area with a premises' data infrastructure, the data outlet comprising:

user interface circuitry providing a plurality of user-data interfaces to said user equipment (see figure 2);

premise interface circuitry providing a premise-data interface to said data infrastructure (i.e., note figure 4), and

a bridge circuitry (i.e., bus or data cable 186 in figure 4) providing data packet transfer between said user interface circuitry and said premise interface circuitry; and

a compact housing that (a) is configured of rigid material and has a rear and a front; (b) encloses said user interface circuitry, said premise interface circuitry, and said bridge circuitry, and (c) is mountable in or on a wall adjacent said user-operating area such that said front provides said a plurality of user-data interfaces and said rear provides said premise-data interface (also note figures 6, 6a and 6b).

regarding claims 7, 13 and 20, note col.5, lines 16-65.

5. Claims 63, 7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Staber et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,137,866).

Regarding claim 63, Staber et al. ("Staber") teaches a data outlet (i.e., indoor xDSL splitter assembly outlet 10 as shown in figure 1-4 and 6), suitable for connecting user-equipment located in a user-operating area with a premises' data infrastructure (col.3, line 41 through col.4, line 51), the data outlet comprising:

user interface circuitry providing a plurality of user-data interfaces to said user equipment (i.e., signal jacks 34b and 34c in figure 3);

premise interface circuitry providing a premise-data interface to said data infrastructure (i.e., combined signal jack 34a), and

a bridge circuitry providing data packet transfer between said user interface circuitry and said premise interface circuitry (i.e., lowpass filter in splitter circuit 62 and highpass filter in splitter circuit 76, col.5, lines 39-64); and

a compact housing that (a) is configured of rigid material and has a rear and a front; (b) encloses said user interface circuitry, said premise interface circuitry, and said bridge circuitry, and (c) is mountable in or on a wall adjacent said user-operating area such that said front provides said a plurality of user-data interfaces and said rear provides said premise-data interface (also note figures 1 and 3).

Regarding claims 7, 13 and 14, note col.5, line 65 through col.6, line 38.

6. Claims 63, 7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Binder et al. (Pub. No.: US 2006/0203981).

Regarding claim 63, Binder et al. ("Binder") teaches a data outlet (i.e., telephone outlet for implementing a local area network as shown in figure 5), suitable for connecting user-equipment located in a user-operating area with a premises' data infrastructure, the data outlet comprising:

user interface circuitry providing a plurality of user-data interfaces to said user equipment (i.e., DCE connectors 56 and telephone connector 53);

premise interface circuitry providing a premise-data interface to said data infrastructure (i.e., connector 54), and

a bridge circuitry providing data packet transfer between said user interface circuitry and said premise interface circuitry (i.e., lowpass filters LPFs and highpass filters HPFs); and

a compact housing that (a) is configured of rigid material and has a rear and a front; (b) encloses said user interface circuitry, said premise interface circuitry, and said bridge circuitry, and (c) is mountable in or on a wall adjacent said user-operating area such that said front provides said a plurality of user-data interfaces and said rear provides said premise-data interface (note figure 13).

Regarding claims 7, 13 and 14, note paragraphs [0062] and [0097].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volansky et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,807,139), Mayball et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,807,139), Staber et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,137,866) or Binder et al. (Pub. No.: US 2006/0203981) in view of Whittaker et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,130,893 **as recited in the previous Office Action**).

Regarding claim 33, Volansky, Mayball, Staber and Binder, each teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for a processor operative to provide high-level service to the user via one of the user data interface. However, Whittaker et al. ("Whittaker") teaches a plurality of "outlets", e.g., terminal adapters 20a-20b as shown in figure 1, each comprises a processor (i.e., central control unit 68 as shown in figure 3) for controlling active components in the adapter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the processor for controlling active components in the adapter, as taught by Whittaker, into view of Volansky, Mayball, Staber or Binder in order to control connections to devices in the outlet.

9. Claims 16-17, 21 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binder (Pub. No.: US 2004/0196835 A1) in view of Whittaker et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,130,893), as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Menon et al. (US 2001/0022784 A1).

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Volansky, Mayball, Staber, Bind and Whittaker, in combination, fails to clearly teach the high service levels including data encryption and authentication. However, Menon et al. ("Menon") teaches such well-known features in paragraph [0071].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of the high service levels including data encryption and authentication, as taught by Menon, into view of Volansky, Mayball, Staber or Binder and Whittaker in order to provide security to the outlets.

Regarding claim 21, Menon further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0363].

Regarding claim 34, Menon further teaches limitations of the claims in figure 1 and paragraphs [0071], [0083], [0095], [0221] and [0363].

10. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volansky, Mayball, Staber or Binder (Pub. No.: US 2004/0196835 A1) in view of Whittaker et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,130,893), as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Vaughn et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,661,893 *also cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claims 18-19, the combination fails to teach status information, which includes a problem.

Vaughn teaches a telephone loop monitoring system in (see col. 4) wherein status information can reported to a user via a display means.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Vaughn into that of the combination thus making it possible to take corrective measures or request help when necessary.

Art Unit: 2614

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand Carry Deliveries to:

Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: June 2007